

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

EUCLIDES SOTO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SHERMAN-FEINBERG CORPORATION,
FARNSWORTH FIBRE CORPORATION,
and UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL 421-U,

Defendants.

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

Civil Action No. 04-10892-JLT

ORDER

July 12, 2006

TAURO, J.

After the Hearing held on July 12, 2006, this court hereby orders that:

1. Plaintiffs' Motion to Attach Assets of the United Steelworkers of America [# 65] is DENIED;
2. Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion to Attach Assets of the United Steelworkers of America [# 99] is DENIED;
3. Union Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Motion to Attach [# 71] is DENIED;
4. Union Defendants' Motion in Limine to Limit or Exclude Evidence Relating to Emotional Distress or Punitive Damages with Respect to Plaintiffs' Duty of Fair Representation Claims [# 74] is DENIED AS MOOT;
5. Union Defendants' Motion in Limine to Preclude the Taking of Evidence Relating

to the Plaintiffs' Duty of Fair Representation Claims Occurring Before November 5, 2003 [# 76] is DENIED AS MOOT;

6. Union Defendants' Motion in Limine to Preclude Unspecific Testimony Relating to Incidents in the Farnsworth Fibre Plant [# 78] is DENIED;
7. Union Defendants' Motion in Limine to Preclude Evidence Relating to the State-Law Discrimination Claims [# 79] is DENIED AS MOOT as Plaintiffs withdrew their state law discrimination claims in open court;
8. Union Defendants' Motion in Limine to Preclude the Taking of Evidence Relating to the Plaintiffs' Discrimination Claims Occurring Beyond the Statute of Limitations [# 77] is DENIED;
9. Union Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion to Attach Assets of the United Steelworkers of America [# 103] is DENIED;
10. Union Defendants' Motion for Leave to File a Reply to Plaintiffs Opposition to Union Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion to Attach [# 111] is DENIED;
11. Union Defendants' Motion for Leave to File a Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Union's Motion to Strike Portions of Second Amended Complaint or, in the Alternative, for a Continuance to Engage in Further Discovery Regarding Newly Asserted Claims [# 110] is DENIED;
12. Union Defendants' Motion to Strike Amended Complaint, or In the Alternative, For a Continuance to Engage in Further Discovery Regarding Newly Asserted Claims [# 106] is ALLOWED to the extent that Plaintiffs' claim under 42 U.S.C. §

1981 is stricken from Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint;

13. Plaintiffs' Motion for an Order [# 112] is DENIED; and

14. A Trial will be scheduled.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Joseph L. Tauro
United States District Judge